



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

JUL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,076	08/27/2001	Andrew Eric Carlson	09712-119001-Z-265	3026
26161	7590	11/12/2003	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			LYONS, MICHAEL A	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2877		

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/940,076	CARLSON, ANDREW ERIC
	Examiner Michael A. Lyons	Art Unit 2877

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 11, 2003 has been entered.

Claim Objections

Claim 31 objected to because of the following informalities: firstly, from the placement of the claim, it appears that claim 31 should be dependant on claim 21, not claim 32. Additionally, the word "a" should be in line 4 between "further comprises [a] plurality of . . ." . Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommargren (4,746,216).

Regarding claims 21 and 32, Sommargren (Fig. 1) discloses a tilted shear plate 16 with multiple output ports (23A, 27A) that transmit a corresponding intermediate beam (30, 31) from input beam 13, and a polarizing beam splitter 40 with polarizing beam splitting interface 42 to

separate each intermediate beam into a reference and a measurement beam. This apparatus, however, does not disclose an integral block containing the output ports and the polarizing beam splitter integral to one another.

The separate shear plate and polarizing beam splitter of Sommargren, while separate, are the same apparatus with the same functionality as the combined block in the instant application. Making the two separate elements integral to one another, that is, attached in the same overall block, would maintain the functionality of the Sommargren device; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the shear plate and beam splitter of Sommargren into a single, integral device.

As for claim 22, output port 23A reflects a portion of input beam 13 to intermediate beam 14 inside the shear plate.

As for claim 23, output port 23A has a polarization coating on it, separating the input beam by polarization. As a result, the intensity of the resulting intermediate beams remains constant.

As for claims 24-26, the output port 23A causes the input beam 13 to be split into two portions, portion 14 remaining inside the shear plate, with portion 30 exiting the plate for the beam splitter.

As for claim 27, the measurement and reference beams from a polarizing beam splitter will have orthogonal polarizations from the function of the beam splitter.

As for claim 28, Sommargren discloses corner reflector 45.

As for claim 29, the shear plate has a coating 25A for reflecting beam 14 towards the next output port 27A.

As for claim 30, Sommargren discloses reference plate 71, measurement plate 70, and a quarter-wave plate 44 positioned between the beam splitter and the reference and measurement plates.

As for claim 31, the normal operation of the beam splitter will allow for the recombination of measurement and reference beams. Sommargren also discloses a single retro-reflector as corner reflector 45, but not the plurality of retro-reflectors as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to duplicate the single corner reflector in order to produce a plurality of them, since it has been held that the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. V. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael A. Lyons whose telephone number is 703-305-1933. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank G Font can be reached on 703-308-4877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0935.

MAL
October 29, 2003



Samuel A. Turner
Primary Examiner